

The NUCLEAR ENERGY STUDY GROUP at Heritage Heights Retirement Community in Concord submits the following, which we would like to be included in the postings on your website for consideration by the Energy Planning Advisory Board.

If one looks into the problem of how to assure that New England will have adequate clean electrical power, the unavoidable conclusion must be “no more coal-fired power plants”, and the only alternative presently available on a reliable and large enough scale is nuclear power.

A small self-chosen “energy study group” at Heritage Heights Retirement Community in Concord has become convinced of the need to get started now with the task of “selling” the advantages of “going nuclear”. We have undertaken the challenge of doing that, even though we realize that there may be some local opposition still lingering from the considerable resistance demonstrated when Seabrook I was proposed.

The Concord Monitor has furthered our effort by printing prominently our letter to Gov. Lynch setting forth our conclusions. We are also pleased to see that the Union Leader appears to be backing nuclear power in “Another View” on May 11. In that, two very influential energy experts, Messrs. Brett and Gustin, emphasized that for a number of reasons, “policy makers need to recognize the significant operational, economic and environmental benefits of nuclear energy....”

A powerful argument is the fact that the cost of electricity from nuclear power is competitive with coal and actually less than for natural gas. Furthermore, it will not increase while the price of fossil fuels continues to rise. Also, the coal-fired plants will incur additional costs to remove mercury and sulfur, as will be mandated in New Hampshire.

So the people making decisions in the power company board rooms will be opting for nuclear for the new power plants that will have to be built to meet the growing demand for electricity. Better that the two billion dollar investment for the next new power plant in New England go to New Hampshire. The best place for it is at Seabrook, which was designed to have two reactors. Much of the infrastructure for that second reactor is already in place.

To start our “selling campaign”, we wrote a letter to Gov. Lynch. A copy of our letter follows.

THE NUCLEAR ENERGY STUDY GROUP
AT HERITAGE HEIGHTS RETIREMENT COMMUNITY
April 7, 2006

The Honorable John H. Lynch
107 North Main Street - Room 208
Concord, N.H. 03301

Dear Governor Lynch:

A small group of us here at Heritage Heights Retirement Community have become concerned about the problems of air pollution – which locally is causing acid rain due to sulfur and nitrogen oxides, causing warnings to be necessary about eating too much locally-caught fish due to mercury pollution, causing haze and asthma due to ozone, and, especially, increasing the carbon dioxide concentration, which may have catastrophic global warming consequences. That the evidences of global warming have become so apparent and worrisome is actually the cover story in two national news magazines this week. All of these problems come from using fossil fuels, especially coal. There are processes which can be added to coal-fired power plants to remove some of the sulfur and mercury, and very likely those plants will soon be required by law to do so. But this will add still more to the cost of our electricity, and do nothing about the seriously increasing global warming effect.

Because of the ever-increasing demand for electricity, more power plants will certainly be built. Now is the time to determine what kind they should be. Many people would like more “sustainable” power such as wind, solar and biomass, which do not contribute to global warming. But all of these alternatives now have two very serious drawbacks – they are rather more costly, and so far are on such small scale. They no doubt will grow in use, but for many years they will remain unimportant.

But there is one alternative which does not pollute the atmosphere, is competitive with same scale as coal-fired plants, has a fuel source at least as plentiful as coal, and does not have a smokestack spewing out tons of carbon dioxide at a rate which is 3.5 times the many tons per day of coal being burned. That alternative is NUCLEAR POWER.

The 2005 Energy Bill passed last year by Congress recognizes the need for more nuclear power plants, and will provide a small subsidy for the first five new nuclear plants. And the Chairman of the Northeast Energy Group, an association of power companies, stated two weeks ago that New England must start building more nuclear power plants to meet the growing demand throughout the region. The alternatives are the highly-polluting coal plants or the more expensive gas-turbine plants.

The obvious best location for the next new nuclear power plant in New England is at Seabrook. The Seabrook Power Plant here in New Hampshire was designed to have two nuclear reactors. All the space and infrastructure needed for a second reactor is already in place, including, most remarkably, the long tunnels extending more than a mile offshore for the intake and discharge of the seawater

needed for the steam turbines' condensers, and which are sized for two reactors.

When "Seabrook II" is installed there, it will mean an infusion of \$2 billion new investment into New Hampshire. This will have a significant effect on local and State tax income and employment. Yet, we were amazed to learn, Governor Lynch, you do not favor promoting Seabrook II.

It is urgent that we in New Hampshire realize that we are now in the 21st century. Although widespread use of coal did make the industrial age possible, and it still contributes to maintaining the lifestyle we now enjoy as a result (50% of our electricity comes from coal-fired power plants), we are now beginning to realize the extent of its detrimental effects – especially, global warming. Fortunately, during the past 50 years a new source of energy has been developed and proven on a large scale: nuclear energy, which now supplies 20% of our electricity. It is a proven technology, with 103 reactors operating in the U.S. and more than 400 worldwide.

Knowing what we do now, it should be easy to make the right choice. Nuclear instead of coal has many benefits and entails no sacrifices. Also, NIMBY does not apply, because we already have nearby a nuclear reactor which has been a very good neighbor. Governor, you need to begin promoting Seabrook II ! We're doing it now among our fellow residents here.

William Klapproth, Dana Robinson, John Hardie, Sidney Schoeffler, and Ellen Little
149 East Side Drive, Concord, NH, 03301

Submitted by William Klapproth, 149 East Side Dr. Concord, NH, 03301